GlobalResearch
Center for Research on Globalization

Vaccine Amnesia: Why Did the Media Stop Covering Vaccine Disasters?

Forgotten news segments show how widely acknowledged vaccine injuries were before the media was bought out by the pharmaceutical industry

By A Midwestern Doctor
Global Research, October 03, 2025
The Forgotten Side of Medicine

Region: USA
Theme: Media Disinformation, Science and Medicine

Story at a Glance:

- *Something about vaccines (e.g., their promise of a simple injection being sufficient to safely and effectively end all diseases) has always deeply appealed to the minds of government officials.*
- *Unfortunately, that promise is often a lie, so over and over, unsafe and ineffective vaccines enter the market. When this happens, the officials who are invested in them do everything they can to protect the vaccines from scrutiny and cover up each red flag that emerges and the medical field has dutifully complied.*
- *In previous decades, the press was much less corrupt than it is now and occasionally would air real investigations into what happened which highlighted the immense suffering many have faced.*
- *Collectively, these segments both show how much more candid the media used to be about the issues, and how closely many of them match what we see now.*
- *Since those TV programs made many who were suffering from the vaccine injuries realize they were not alone, this created a massive PR problem the vaccine industry, which was eventually solved by preventing any future segments from airing.*
- *This article was written in the hope that collective amnesia could be broken as we are now at the precipice of the pharmaceutical industry's grip over the media being broken.*

***

A key theme I've tried to highlight in this publication is that the same medical catastrophes keep repeating (because those responsible are never held accountable), so by understanding what happened in the past, you can see and understand what is happening now and what will likely happen in the future.

For example, because vaccines are "risky but necessary," the medical profession and government, again and again, concluded that they needed to tell the public all vaccines were "safe and effective" as the potential injuries a mass vaccination campaign would cause were outweighed by "necessary" benefit the vaccines could offer. As such, examples can be found again and again of severe injuries being systematically covered up for the "greater good" (e.g., the earliest documented example I know of this happened in 1874 with the

smallpox vaccine) and health authorities concocting the same set of excuses we've seen since smallpox as to why those vaccines failed to prevent the diseases they were supposed to.

Since the risks outweigh the benefits for most vaccines (detailed here), a mass vaccination paradigm can only be sustained by censoring all evidence of harm, and then using that absence of evidence as proof the vaccines are safe. As such, over the decades, we've seen more and more be done to conceal those harms.

For example, as I showed here, for almost a century, severe neurological injuries following vaccination were routinely reported in the medical literature. Now however, vaccine injuries are censored, and it is virtually impossible to get anything critical of vaccines published in a "reputable" academic journal.

Likewise, despite the "science" saying vaccines are safe, it's nearly impossible to get ahold of any raw dataset which could objectively answer that question—which Steve Kirsch awoke the public to throughout COVID-19 by publicizing the endless stonewalling he ran into during his relentless quest to get that data.

[Note: VAERS, a publicly available injury database the public could submit to, was originally created as part of the 1986 National Childhood Vaccine Injury Act to address an unwillingness by both doctors and vaccine makers to ever report injuries (and hence claim the absence of them was evidence they didn't happen). Once the act was enacted, the media, government, and medical industry has done all they could to sabotage and disparage it (as they never wanted an open reporting system).]

Oddly enough, one of the few datasets we got access to on the dangers of the COVID vaccines originated from South Korea, where electronic medical records from the national health insurance service (totaling roughly half of Seoul's population) were analyzed, which revealed a large increase in many common disorders.

.

Bursitis	96-170%	Disc Herniation	79-133%
Rotator cuff syndrome	173-456%	Spondylosis	24-135%
Frozen Shoulder	91-216%	Plantar fasciitis	90-326%
de-Quervain tenosynovitis	98-85%	Achilles tendenitis	99-257%
Endometriosis	8-228%	Menstrual disorder	35-186%
Bruise	77-526%	Alopecia	125-274%
Shingles	87-212%	Warts	66-158%
Visual impairment	183-573%	Glaucoma	47-123%
Tinnitus	20-102%	Inner ear disease	112-178%
Middle ear disease	74-178%	Other ear disease	58-113%
Periodontal disease	23-260%		

.

Following this, another study was published, which revealed the COVID vaccines caused a 68% increase in depression, a 44% increase in anxiety and dissociative, stress-related, and

somatoform disorders, and a 93.4% increase in sleep disorders.

I mention this, both because it's unconscionable no one else was ever given access to databases which could have shown these serious issues, and because recently, I learned through Sonia Elijah that they completed a study everyone who's seen a rapid cancer following COVID vaccination has waited years for. Assessing the link between COVID vaccines and cancer, it found six were significantly elevated in vaccine recipients one year after receiving the vaccine:

- Thyroid (+35.1%),
- Stomach (+33.5%),
- Colorectal (+28.3%),
- Lung (+53.3%),
- Breast (+19.7%),
- Prostate (+68.7%).

Additionally, they found many cancers were increased by boosting:

- Pancreas (+125%)
- Stomach (+23%)
- Brain (+24%)
- Esophagus (+21%)
- Liver (+17%)
- Bile Ducts (+55%)
- Bladder (+21%)
- Cervical (+27%),
- Prostate (+26%),
- Hodgkin's Lymphoma (+201%)

Note: the increase in Pancreas and Stomach cancer was statistically significant.

If you take a step back, and consider how many people received the vaccines, the social costs of cancer spikes like these are staggering and the decision to withhold data like this from the public to "avoid creating vaccine hesitancy" was one of the greatest crimes of the COVID catastrophe.

Mass Media Censorship

Actions like this were only possible due to the corporate media suppressing all dissent against the vaccines—even when large numbers of Americans felt the mandatory vaccines were severely injuring or killing their recipients and the press hence had a foundational duty to cover.

> In response to a FOIA request filed by TheBlaze, [Biden's] HHS revealed that it purchased advertising from major news networks including ABC, CBS, and NBC, as well as cable TV news stations **Fox News**, CNN, and MSNBC, legacy media publications including the New York Post, the Los Angeles Times, and the Washington Post, digital media companies like BuzzFeed News and Newsmax, and hundreds of local newspapers

> and TV stations. These outlets were collectively responsible for publishing countless articles and video segments regarding the vaccine that were nearly uniformly positive about the vaccine in terms of both its efficacy and safety.

Note: the amount spent per network is unknown, but likely totaled a billion.

Because of this, many people in the media wanted to speak out against the vaccines, but effectively could not, and to my knowledge, other than a few Fox hosts lightly criticizing them, only two did. One, a recently hired reporter at a local station, on live television announced Fox was muzzling stories the public wanted to hear (and was promptly fired) after which she provided secret recordings to Project Veritas corroborating this censorship.

The other was Tucker Carlson, who was able to leverage both being the most popular news host in America and having a show which did not rely upon pharmaceutical funding to speak out against the vaccines without being fired. Nonetheless, this was still a huge risk for him and eventually, after airing this remarkable 4-19-23 segment (which took a lot of courage), at immense cost to Fox News, was immediately fired.

After leaving Fox News, Tucker began speaking openly about how much pharmaceutical money prevented stories highlighting their dangers from ever being aired. Likewise, other former news hosts have corroborated his accounts. For example:

> When I was on Fox News and we talked about the possibility of vaccine injuries … They would RUN out to the set to tell you to shut that down.—Megyn Kelley

Likewise, Sharyl Attkisson (an acclaimed CBS investigative journalist) has extensively chronicled (e.g., in her 2020 book and even more so in her 2025 book) how in the early 2000s, the pharmaceutical industry, feeling the pressure from negative coverage of disastrous vaccination programs was creating for them, lobbied to prevent future negative coverage. Once this happened, it became impossible for her to air well produced segments which were critical of any vaccine initiative, and likewise, tha*t in the* post-2000s, stories on vaccine risks "disappeared" due to advertiser pressure.

However, things were not always this way. Rather, major networks used to air numerous scathing stories about vaccine disasters—and in many cases, the dangers they covered were so explicit by current journalistic standards that I frequently find sharing those (previously inconceivable) segments with people on the fence about vaccination opens their minds to the entire mess.

Let's now review ***some*** of the forgotten vaccine disasters and the evolving censorship emerging alongside them.

Mass Censorship

The Vietnam War was considered by many to be the event that broke the public's trust in the Federal Government.

[Note: many believe the specific event which turned the American public against the Vietnam War was the My Lai massacre—an event where American soldiers decided to commit war crimes against Vietnamese civilians until a different group of American soldiers on their own volition decided to stop the massacre. I went back and forth on explicitly detailing it in this article, as I believe it's critical to understand what war brings out in

people, but I eventually decided it was too graphic for many of the readers.]

This loss of trust in the government of course alarmed the government, and led to the Pentagon conducting a coordinated campaign to prevent this from happening again, which was accomplished by:

- Ending the draft and switching to an all volunteer army.
- Ensuring the public was only fed a sanitized picture of what happened in each future war (e.g., with embedded journalists providing government approved footage and the mass media being strongly discouraged from providing any footage which exposed the horrors of each war).

[Note: Major Colin Powell was one of the Pentagon officers who led the effort to cover up the Mai Lai Massacre. He then rose through the ranks, eventually becoming George Bush's Secretary of Defense and infamously lied to the UN about Iraq's weapons of mass destruction—a lie that killed hundreds of thousands of people and cost the US trillions of dollars. Powell's case is one of many which illustrates how much the government rewards those who cover up its atrocities.]

It is hard to even begin to describe how much work was put into hiding the horrors of war from the public, and sadly it was remarkably effective, transforming war from something much of the American public vehemently opposed to an abstract idea they were largely apathetic towards.

[*Note: the best documentary I have seen explaining how military propaganda transformed as the decades went by is "Why We Fight."]*

The sanitizing of war, in turn, has many parallels to the evolving medical censorship we've faced. For example, the same public relations firm that created a heart-wrenching **but entirely made-up** testimony to drag the US into the Gulf War, has a long history of working with the pharmaceutical industry and was contracted to both promote the COVID narrative and eliminate vaccine hesitancy.[1,2,3]

Turning Points in Medical Censorship

Numerous medical catastrophes have happened which provoked widespread public outrage, and like the Vietnam War, those events brought the government to conclude it was imperative the public was prevented from becoming aware of future medical atrocities. Some of those events include:

The Polio Vaccine

In 1955, after an expedited approval, a much heralded vaccine was released by the government, and two weeks later, cases began emerging across America of children who had become paralyzed in the limb that was injected with Salk's polio vaccine.

After some investigation, it was discovered that:

- Only two of the five vaccine manufacturers had produced the same "safe" vaccines used in the clinical trials—which meant many of the vaccines the public got (which at the time were a new experimental technology) had never been tested in humans.

- At the urging of Salk, when the vaccine was mass produced, a different and less safe production process was used for the vaccine.

[Note: this also happened with the COVID-19 vaccines and many now believe this is a key reason why they were so dangerous.]

- Bernice Eddy, an NIH employee, had immediately discovered this mass produced vaccine caused paralysis in monkeys.
  Note: Eddy had previously upset the NIH after she discovered that adenovirus vaccines caused cancers (which caused the NIH to put up innumerable obstacles to her work) but eventually Eddy won and adenovirus vaccines stopped being given to children—at least until COVID-19 (as the J&J vaccine is a modified adenovirus).
- All of the paralyzing vaccines came from the same manufacturer (Cutter Laboratories).

[Note: later paralyzing lots were also identified from Wyeth (better known for making the highly dangerous DPT vaccine), but the general public was never made aware of it—which the head of the CDC's polio surveillance unit believed was done to prevent the public from realizing the Polio vaccine in general was unsafe and ineffective.]

- The (early) FDA delegated testing of the vaccine for safety to the vaccine manufacturers rather than doing so itself.

[Note: I believe this is a key reason why "hot" vaccine lots that disproportionately injure their recipients are a recurring issue in medicine.]

There were many safety concerns with the testing of the Salk vaccine, but the professional publications chose to censor them and instead continually repeated the message that the vaccine was completely safe and effective.

The public was understandably outraged about this, the government found itself in a public relations crisis, and numerous lawsuits dragged out against Cutter in the courts. In response to this happening, the Federal government then decided to assume a direct involvement in each aspect of the vaccine program, thus switching from being a largely neutral external auditor to being a major stakeholder. As you might guess, this conflict of interest made the government be motivated to cover up any safety issues with its vaccines (e.g. to protect its investment or to not look bad to the public) and before long business as usual resumed with the Polio vaccine.

To quote *Turtles All The Way Down*:

> Perhaps the most disturbing element of the entire program has been the disparity between the risks that were known to be involved and the repeated assurances of safety.—Paul Meier, professor of epidemiology at the Johns Hopkins University School of Public Health
>
> The National Foundation, in a memo sent to doctors, also stated emphatically that the [polio] vaccine was completely safe and that the risk of ensuing paralysis was "zero".
>
> The best way to push forward a new program is to decide on what you think the best

> decision is and not question it thereafter, and further, not to raise questions before the public or expose the public to open discussion of the issue.—Paul Meier speaking at an expert panel on the vaccine.

In 1960, five years after the Cutter incident, Bernice Eddy, a NIH employee had determined that the polio vaccines were contaminated with a cancer-causing virus (SV-40) and not fit to give to the public. When she alerted her superiors, she was ordered to not disclose it (so the public would not lose its trust in the vaccine program) but eventually decided to publish her findings at a cancer conference—after which she was immediately demoted and lost her lab.

Note: in 1959, government officials had become aware their vaccine caused cancer and were frantically trying to find a way to address it (the problem was ultimately a product of cutting costs by producing the vaccines with imported monkey kidneys) while simultaneously doing all they could to promote them to the public.

As time moved forwards, more evidence emerged showing there was widespread contamination in the polio vaccines with the SV-40 virus. Finally, in 1963, the federal government forced the vaccine manufacturers to stop growing the vaccine on contaminated SV-40 monkey kidneys—at which point between 40-98 million Americans (and many more globally) were infected—although a case can be made SV-40 was present until around the year 2000 in some of the vaccines. This, in turn led to a massive increase in cancer, which, until the COVID vaccines, was unprecedented:

.



.

[Note: while US health authorities declared SV-40 does not cause cancer in humans, many accounts exist of physicians who observed an explosion of cancer after the polio vaccines

hit the market. I believe this theory is valid as one of the most common therapies we've found which consistently helps solid tumors (which are what SV-40 was suspected to cause) appears to function as an antidote to the SV-40 virus. More recently, it was discovered that the reckless method that was chosen to quickly mass-produce the COVID vaccines resulted in them being contaminated with the promoter region of the SV-40 virus (which many in turn suspect is carcinogenic).]

Additionally, many horrible kidney diseases are strongly associated with SV-40 (and likewise have exploded in incidence since the Polio vaccines hit the market). Sadly, since SV-40 was introduced to the population through the vaccine program (and transmits between humans and fetuses) there has been a general reluctance to study its danger—or to acknowledge it was still present in the vaccine supply decades later.

Click here to read the full article.

*

Click the share button below to email/forward this article. Follow us on Instagram and X and subscribe to our Telegram Channel. Feel free to repost Global Research articles with proper attribution.

Featured image source

Global Research is a reader-funded media. We do not accept any funding from corporations or governments. Help us stay afloat. Click the image below to make a one-time or recurring donation.

The original source of this article is The Forgotten Side of Medicine
Copyright © A Midwestern Doctor, The Forgotten Side of Medicine, 2025

Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page

Become a Member of Global Research

Articles by: **A Midwestern Doctor**

Disclaimer: The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: publications@globalresearch.ca

www.globalresearch.ca contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: publications@globalresearch.ca